

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINEARTS
18 January 1966
INDEX

	PAGE
ADMINISTRATION	
3. West Front of the Capitol	1
4. Parking in Public Space	2
REVIEWS-SUBMISSIONS	
1. <u>Temporary Committee on Pennsylvania Avenue</u>	
Proposed Design of National Square	2
2. <u>General Services Administration, Public Buildings Service</u>	
a. Labor Department Building, Revised Design	2
b. Aquarium - Revised Design	2-3
c. Selection of Sculptor for Post Office, Independence, Mo.	3
d. Bust of President John F. Kennedy	3
3. <u>National Institutes of Health</u>	
Emergency Virus Isolation Facility - Proposed Design	3-4
4. <u>Department of the Navy</u>	
Service Club, Bolling AFB	4
5. <u>District of Columbia Government</u>	
a. <u>Department of Highways and Traffic</u>	
Proposed Landscaping for Virginia Avenue	45
b. <u>Department of Buildings and Grounds</u>	
(1) Blow-Pierce Elementary School	5
(2) Seaton Elementary School	5
(3) Woodson Senior High	6

c. Department of Licenses and Inspections

Shipstead-Luce Act

(1) Mills Building, 17th St. & Pa. Ave. 6

(2) Capitol Hill Club 6

(3) Proposed Speaker Martin Building 6

(4) Reserve Officers Assn. Building 7

(5) *Building Applications - Appendix 1*
Old Georgetown Act 7

Building Applications - Appendix 2 7

Georgetown University Master Plan 7

6. National Park Service, National Capital Region

West Rawlins Park - Development Plan 8

INTERVIEWS

1. National Capital Transportation Agency

Progress Report 8-9

2. General Services Administration, Public Buildings Service

a. Aquarium 9

b. Labor Department Building 9-10

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
HELD IN WASHINGTON, D.C.

I. CONVENE, ROOM 7000, INTERIOR DEPARTMENT BUILDING

A regular monthly meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts was held in its office in the Interior Department Building on 18 January 1966. The members met, pursuant to notice, in executive session at 10:15 a.m. with William Walton, Chairman, presiding.

Present were: William Walton
Gordon Bunshaft
Burnham Kelly
Theodore Roszak
Hideo Sasaki (afternoon session)
John Carl Warnecke

Staff: C.H. Atherton, Secretary
Donald Myer, Asst. Secy
Nancee Black, Legislative Asst.
Myra Younker, Editor

NCPC: Arnall T. Connell

Recorder: Alice Chiang, a.m.
Albert Sparks, p.m.

II. ADMINISTRATION

1. The Commission decided to hold its next meeting on 15-16 February 1966.
2. The Minutes of the December 1965 meeting were approved.
3. West Front of the Capitol (added to Order of Business)

The Secretary reported that the staff had obtained a copy of the engineering report (5 volumes) on the restoration of the west front of the Capitol. Dr. Meng Te Chang, an engineer familiar with the conditions of the structure of the Capitol, has been retained to analyze the report for the Commission of Fine Arts. His analysis will contain a summary of the report and discuss the feasibility of restoring the existing west front of the Capitol. This will be based on facts within the report and his own observations. For his services, Dr. Chang will receive a fee of \$12.50 per hour for a period of 80 hours or less.

The members authorized the Chairman to take any action, based on Dr. Chang's analysis of the report, he deemed necessary for the preservation of the original West Front design.

4. Parking in Public Spaces

The Secretary reported that no study of details for parking lots had been undertaken by any agency ^{and} ~~the~~ proposed that a study be made by the Commission. A report on existing conditions with recommendations for screening and material use would result. Approximately \$1500 were available for contracting a competent person to make the study. Final selection would be subject to Commission approval.

The Commission approved the proposed study. Chairman Walton recommended that the report be given as the Commission's contribution to Mrs. Johnson's beautification program.

III. REVIEWS-SUBMISSIONS

1. Temporary Committee on Pennsylvania Avenue

Proposed Design of National Square

The Secretary reported that on the following day Nathaniel A. Owings, Chairman, Temporary Committee on Pennsylvania Avenue, would discuss several design proposals for the National Square. Material would be available at that time. Size and shape of the square as well as traffic problems of the area would be discussed.

2. General Services Administration, Public Buildings Service

a. Labor Department Building, Revised Design

The Secretary presented a model and drawings submitted by Pitts, Mebane, Phelps, and White, architectural firm, for this project at D Street, Constitution Avenue, 2nd and 3rd Streets, N.W. He commented on the revised design which incorporated the recommendations of the Commission.

The large mass to the north of the central structure was narrowed and extended over 2nd and 3rd Streets. This revised massing of major sections formed a balanced axis in the area of the District Courts buildings to the west. Obtaining another site for the U.S. Tax Court Building, previously planned for a site to the east of the Labor Department Building, had made this recommendation feasible.

Commenting on the improvement of the design which was more harmonious to the area, the Commission approved the plan. General Services Administration was informed of the Commission's action. *Exhibit A*

b. Aquarium - Revised Design

The Secretary presented a model, plans and elevation drawings

submitted by Welton Becket and Associates, architects, for this project in East Potomac Park.

For a building to be constructed partially underground, the design resembled a flag^T hexagonal ziggurat with several smaller structures on top. The main mass would be surrounded by three hexagonal terraces. A perimeter road with a minibus turnaround provided a direct access to the building - a necessary feature not indicated in previous designs and recommended by the Commission. Tunnels were planned under a series of lagoons or cascades along the side toward the river.

Acknowledging the difficulty in designing an aquarium and especially for this site, the members felt that the plans submitted lacked a clear concept of the project and were inappropriate for this site.

Final action was withheld until a conference with officials of the Department of Interior, General Services Administration and the architect during the afternoon meeting.

c. Selection of Sculptor for Post Office and F.O.B., Independence, Mo.

The Assistant Secretary presented artists' brochures forwarded by the architect and submitted by General Services Administration for the advice of the Commission on the selection of an artist for sculpture to be located at a prominent corner of this building.

After reviewing brochures of Bernard Frazier, John Cranston Heintzelman, and Gabriella Polomy, the members felt that Bernard Frazier was most qualified for this project.

The members discussed visual arts in federal buildings. They felt the Commission should raise the question with General Services Administration concerning provisions made for visual arts which should be a part of the initial concept of the design for buildings and not an afterthought.

d. Bust of President John F. Kennedy

The Secretary presented a request from the Secretary of Interior for advice on the purchase of a bust of President John F. Kennedy by Maurine Ligon.

The members commented that a reproduction of a bust of President Kennedy by Felix W. de Weldon, sculptor, was better. They recommended that the bust by Miss Ligon not be purchased.

3. National Institutes of Health

Emergency Virus Isolation Facility - Proposed Design

The Secretary presented a perspective drawing, site plan and floor plans submitted by Sanders and Thomas, Inc., architects/engineers. The site is located adjacent to the Medical Library on the National Institutes of Health campus.

Reviewing the site plan and photograph of the area, the members felt that the architect and officials of the National Institutes of Health should explain the concept of the site. They stated that apparently no use had been made of the master plan. They remarked that circulation, location of buildings, handling of the land itself, relationship to functions and to the proposed new road, etc., had not been considered. They felt that a detailed plan for this section of the master plan should be submitted.

Final action was withheld until a conference with officials of National Institutes of Health and the architect on the following day.

4. Department of the Navy

Service Club, Bolling AFB - Proposed Design

The Secretary presented a model, site plan, perspective, drawings and floor plans submitted by Lyles, Bissett, Carlisle and Wolff, architects, for this project in the Bolling/Anacostia Military Cantonment.

To be constructed of brick and concrete, materials used in nearby buildings, the Service Club would define the square and axis as indicated in the master plan.

Final action was withheld until a meeting with officials of the Department of the Navy and the architects on the following day.

5. District of Columbia Government

a. Department of Highways and Traffic

Proposed Landscaping for Virginia Avenue

The Secretary presented numerous drawings submitted by Dan Kiley, landscape architect, who was commissioned by the D.C. Highway Department to study Virginia Avenue. He commented that the designer had concentrated on enclosing the Avenue and had increased the axiality of it.

At the western terminus, a large fountain was planned on National Park Service land. Retaining the Highway Department's channelization islands, the architect planned thick planting of trees which framed the Avenue in those areas. Dense planting of trees geometrically lined was indicated in the area intersecting the E Street Expressway. Kelly Park, east of the State Department building would be redesigned to reinforce the enclosure of the Avenue. Other small parks would be redesigned also, to continue the

enclosure of the Avenue.

The members felt the basic plan was an improvement over the National Capital Planning Commission's original plan. They remarked that the plan for dense and regular planting of trees appeared overdone. Single lines, or occasionally double rows would be more appropriate for the Avenue. In some adjacent areas tree massing might be more informal.

Final action was withheld until a conference with officials of the Department of Highways and Traffic and the architects on the following day.

b. Department of Buildings and Grounds

(1) Blow-Pierce Elementary School - Revised Design

The Assistant Secretary presented and reviewed a model and drawings submitted by Clas, Riggs, Owens and Ramos, architectural firm, for this project at 20th and Gales Sts., N.E.

With the guidance of the Commission's staff, the architect developed a design having an inner court with the library adjacent to the entrance and the kindergarten rooms on the opposite side of the court. Entrance to the service area was from the alley and parking would be screened.

The members commented on the simplicity of the plan. The fenestration required more study to relieve the monotony. Further design details will be submitted for review.

Final action was withheld until a conference with the officials of the Department of Buildings and Grounds and the architect on the following day.

(2) Seaton Elementary School - Revised Design

The Secretary presented and reviewed a model and drawings submitted by Cassell, Gray and Sulton, architectural firm, for this project at 10th and P Streets, N.W.

Continuing their efforts to aid the architect, the Commission's staff encouraged him to simplify the previous design by developing a plan having only two elements - one for the kindergarten connected to the main section of the building. Although the architect preferred an octagonal shape, the members felt it should be square, rectilinear, or a circle. Details and materials will be submitted.

Final action was withheld until a conference with officials of the Department of Buildings and Grounds and the architect on the following day.

(3) Woodson Senior High - Revised Design

The Assistant Secretary presented a model, perspective drawings, elevations, and plans submitted by McLeod, Ferrara and Ensign, architectural firm for this high-rise school at 55th and Eads St., N.E.

The high rise element was located on the 8 foot plaza section as the Commission had recommended. The gym element extended 8 feet above the plaza. A future addition was suggested to the rear of the high-rise. Ramps leading to the plaza and to the basement were between the walls.

The members felt that the ramps should be treated as an architectural feature and located to permit direct entry to the lobby area of the high rise section. The wall of the plaza/terrace section should be of the same height as the lowest portion of it. This would emphasize the tower more. Several protrusions extending above the terrace wall should be eliminated. The terrace could have temporary exhibitions of sculpture created by the students located at several places indicated in the plans.

Pleased with the design and progress made by the architects, the members withheld final action until a conference with the officials of the Department of Buildings and Grounds and the architects during the following day.

c. Department of Licenses and Inspections

Shipstead-Luce Act

(1) Mills Building, 17th Street and Pennsylvania Ave., N.W.
(Added to the Order of Business)

The Secretary presented elevation drawings and plans submitted by Edwin Weihe, architect, for incorporating a series of planters around this building. The planters were a way of developing a unified treatment of ventilators that were at sidewalk level.

The members felt the purpose of the ventilators should be known. The placement of the planters had no rhythm and marred the arcade. The paving pattern, however, was quite appropriate.

(2) Capitol Hill Club, 4-story addition to Existing Building, 1st and C Streets, S.E. (Withdrawn)

(3) Proposed Speaker Martin Building, 4-story Office Building 1st Street between C and D Streets, S.E.

No objection. Chairman Walton requested the staff to assist in design refinement.

(4) Reserve Officers Association Building, Proposed 5-Story Building, 109-113 1st St., N.E.

The Secretary presented drawings submitted by Mills, Petticord and Mills, architect, for this project. He commented on the site east of the old Senate Office building. The proposed design was simple in massing, and harmonious with adjacent cornice and surface treatments.

The Commission's approval of this project was reported to the Department of Licenses and Inspections.

(5) Building Applications - Appendix 1

(5) The Commission approved the action taken by the staff on Shipstead-Luce Applications on Appendix 1.

Exhibit B

Old Georgetown Act

(1) Building Applications - Appendix 2

There were no objections to the actions taken on the Old Georgetown Applications listed in Appendix 2.

Exhibit C

(2) Georgetown University Master Plan

The Secretary presented a model, site plan, elevation drawings, floor plans, photographs of the area, submitted by John Carl Warnecke and Associates, architectural firm for this project. He pointed out the various areas of the campus - living, indoor/outdoor athletics, educational, administration, hospital, parking lots, etc., and discussed the University's present property line and land use, and proposed acquisitions of land in residential areas east of the campus. The current programs and those proposed for 1985 were illustrated.

The site of the proposed Library was discussed in relationship to the land use and proposal for future expansion, to current programs and the 1985 plan. The University's proposal to extend its formal campus to the East appeared disruptive to existing Georgetown Street patterns and therefore undesirable. The Visitation Convent and a private estate controlled the vacant adjacent areas. Acquisition of these areas would be difficult.

Bound by Public Law 808 - Old Georgetown Act of 1950 - to preserve the character of this well defined area, the Commission members felt that every effort should be made to encourage and assist the officials of Georgetown University in acquiring the more desirable and less populated land.

Final action was withheld until a conference with officials of the University and representatives of the architect's office on the following day.

6. National Park Service, National Capital Region

West Rawlins Park - Development Plan

The Secretary presented plans submitted by the National Park Service for the development of West Rawlins Park, E Street between 19th and 20th Sts., N.W. He compared the plan with the design of Rawlins Park. Rather than a mirror image of Rawlins Park, the design had a central area with shade trees. Water panels were planned on either side of the central area. Trees and sculpture would screen the E Street Expressway tunnel to the west of the new park area.

The members commented that the center should remain open and the magnolias placed in rows repeating those of the existing park. To contain the park and keep it from fading out at the western end the members felt trees should be planted there and planted also in the area of the E Street Expressway Tunnel.

Final action was withheld until a conference with officials of the National Park Service, National Capital Region on the following day.

IV. Inspections

Labor Department and U.S. Tax Court Sites (Canceled)

V. Interviews

1. National Capital Transportation Agency

Progress Report

Mr. John Rannells, Director, Office of Architecture, National Capital Transportation Agency discussed the scope of the architectural design for the subway system. The consulting architect, chosen by the Agency, would develop a concept for the whole system with some stations having the same design and others different, depending on areas, approaches, etc. He felt there was an opportunity for collaboration of the arts in spaces that will be provided by the system and spaces related to it. The architect would prepare a long-range design program and develop details for stations downtown. The Transportation Agency, with the architect's advice and assistance, would contract other architects for different stations and different panel designs.

The members commented that one architect should have the whole project. A structural engineer should design the tubes and spaces where people enter. Different engineering solutions to spaces, sides, etc., would give character to the design. Well designed graphics should be considered

essential. Graphics for both surface and underground systems, engineering, and good architectural planning would provide an excellent transportation system which would have unity throughout. A brilliant engineering solution with well designed graphics would be a work of art.

The Commission appreciated Mr. Rannells discussion of the plans for the design of the subway system and recommended that he submit all future developments.

2. General Services Administration, Public Buildings Service

a. Aquarium - Revised Design

Secretary Udall, Department of Interior; Mr. Karel Yasko and Mr. J. Rowland Snyder, General Services Administration; and Mr. Welton Becket, architect, attended the meeting during the discussion of this project.

At the request of the Chairman, Mr. Becket explained the general concept of the two schemes both having architectural merit, he felt. Designed as an octagon shape with terraces up to a podium area where pools and exhibit areas were planned, the building would have a covered entrance, a recommendation of the Commission. A dolphin tank, living stream, and various smaller tanks would be exhibited throughout. Research areas were indicated and the structural system explained. Having taken a landscape architectural approach, Mr. Becket felt the designs expressed the purpose of the building, following the required program, and would be one of the greatest aquariums in the world.

Speaking for the Commission, Mr. Bunshaft acknowledged the numerous problems involved in designing an aquarium. He stated that neither scheme was the right parti for an aquarium in Washington. He commented that a good solution to all problems inherent in the project would result in a design which would express the building's purpose and function and be considered a landmark for the area. The comments of Mr. Roszak and Mr. Kelly emphasized Mr. Bunshaft's statement that the Commission felt the design inadequate for an aquarium and inappropriate for this important site in Washington.

Transcripts Exhibit D.

b. Labor Department Building - Revised Design

Mr. Yasko and Mr. Snyder, General Services Administration, and Mr. Llewelyn Pitts, architect, attended the meeting during the discussion of this project.

Mr. Pitts expressed appreciation of the Commission's recommendation that the north section be elongated and extended over 2nd and 3rd Streets. This required additional land which was purchased and made possible a plaza for

parking 900 automobiles. He commented that the various elements were planned as sites for sculpture and landscape.

The meeting adjourned at 4:33 p.m. to reconvene at 9:30 a.m. on the following day.

Respectfully submitted,



C. H. Atherton
Secretary

19 January 1966

Dear Mr. Knott:

The revised Labor Department design met the wholehearted and enthusiastic approval of the Commission of Fine Arts at its January 18th meeting. The massing, inconformity with our previous suggestions, has produced a design that fits perfectly into the Federal pattern and we feel confident that as it is developed along these lines the resulting building will be one of which you and the rest of us will be very proud.

I am sending you this quick note only because it is always a pleasure to bear good news.

With best wishes always,

William Walton
Chairman

Honorable Lawson B. Knott, Jr.
Administrator
General Services Administration
Washington, D. C.

Exhibit A

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON SHIPSTEAD-LUCE ACT APPLICATIONS

1/18-19/66

NO ADDRESS AND OWNER

PROJECT

SL 66-

65 2332 Mass. Ave., NW Remove present wooden structure as shown in photo.

John M. Ide

ACTION: No obj., 12/22/65.

66 310-1st St., SE New 4-story office bldg. Brick facing painted white.
Capitol Hill Assoc., Inc.

ACTION: No obj. to proposed design. Request plan of external profile of mechanical equip. & roof structures, 1/18/66.

67 6990 Oregon Ave., NW New 2-story brick dwelling.
Dr. C. H. Richmond

ACTION: Resubmit with accurate site plan showing contours & exist. trees on site. Show proposed chgs. to site. See ret'd set of prints for corrections, add north arrows. Note a minimum of 1" break should occur on the Living Rm. & Den exterior wall. Restudy window locations & make window styles uniform. Make sure windows are equally spaced on side elevations about the centerline from roof ridge. Show front porch on side elevation. Show more exact cornice details. Show bay window sill. Window lights proportions should be higher than wide. Omit siding on post between twin windows on 2nd fl. rear. Show bay window projection on front & rear eleva'tns. Indicate all wall & roof lines on 2nd fl. plan. Do not place windows to close to chimney, 1/18/66.

68 109-113 1st St., NE

Reserve Officers Assn. of U.S.

ACTION: App'd. as a prel. design. Request detailed drawings for final approval, 1/19/66.
5-story off. hqtrs. for owner's use with basem., garage for parking & penthouse to house mechanical equipment.

69 1700 Penna. Ave., NW

Hannah O. Klock et al

Pave sidewalk & constr. planting boxes in accordance with plans herewith.

ACTION: Disap'd. Eliminate planting boxes & restudy ventilator grilles flush with sidewalk, 1/18/66.

1/18-19/66

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON SHIPSTEAD-LUCE ACT APPLICATIONS (Continued)

NO ADDRESS AND OWNER

PROJECT

SL 66-

70 1775 N. Portal Dr., NW

Drs. Chas. & Roseline Epps

Enclosure for swimming pool. Encl. exist. porch with
jalousies.

ACTION: No obj. to porch enclosure or pool. Pool enclosure not app'd. Recom. a less commercial type of
lighting. Suggest a simple brick wall with no pilasters & with brick rolock coping, 1/18/66.

72 601-19th St., NW

601-19th St., Inc.

Install flagstone over exist. concrete at entr. to bldg. New
railings & pickets & 2 free-standing lamps at entr. to bldg.

ACTION: Disap'd. See action on SL 66-50, 1/18/66.

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON OLD GEORGETOWN ACT APPLICATIONS

1/18-19/66

<u>NO</u>	<u>ADDRESS AND OWNER</u>	<u>PROJECT</u>
147	1642-33rd St., NW Richard W. Crenshaw	Alterations and revisions.
ACTION:	Superseded by OG 66-170, 1/13/66.	
153	3234 N St., NW Mr & Mrs J. V. Mladek	Alterations & addn.
ACTION:	Not recom'd. Restudy character of rear elevation, relating it more closely to front of house, 1/18/66.	
161	3018 R St., NW G. D. Harrison	Erect brick fence at rear of bldg.
ACTION:	Recom'd., 1/4/66.	
162	1622-29th St., NW Capt. Edward L. Beach	Encl. with face brick one window.
ACTION:	Recom'd., 1/4/66.	
163	2818 P St., NW Alan Ford.	Constr. class B flue. Relocate heater & hot water heater.
ACTION:	Recom'd., provided flue is painted to match bldg., 12/20/65.	
164	1047-31st St., NW R. S. Farmer (commercial)	Install air cond. on roof. Bldg. to be used for office & car wash.
ACTION:	Recom'd. Suggest that aluminum louvers be painted light gray, 1/4/66.	
165	3140 Q St., NW Capt. Geo. B. Riley	Cedar sapling fence, close woven. 6½' high.
ACTION:	Recom'd., 1/4/66.	

Exhibit C

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON OLD GEORGETOWN ACT APPLICATIONS (Continued)

1/18-19/66

NO
OG 66-

ADDRESS AND OWNER

PROJECT

166

3107 M St., NW
Fred Astaire

1 s-f, 22.5 sq-ft sign. Silhouette lighted. Black ltrs., white neon tubing.

ACTION: Not recom'd. Character unsuitable to Georgetown. Sign should be limited to name of business only & no more than 25 sq-ft in size. Recom. simplified sign with character similar to sign used on 1st fl. of this bldg. Suggest opaque ltrs. that may be backlighted as proposed in this subm., 1/18/66.

167

3286-88 M St., NW
Sam Levy (Commercial)
Recom'd., 1/4/66.

Veneer 2nd & 3rd story with same brick as 1st fl.

168

1628-29th St., NW
Chas. Haskins
Recom'd., 1/4/66.

Cut exist. roof & build new dormer windows in 3rd fl. Cover new roof over dormers with slate.

169

1403 Wisc. Ave., NW
Peoples Drug Stores, Inc.

4 signs. 2 on Wisc. Ave. & 2 on "O" St. side. 49 sq-ft total. Illuminated.

ACTION: Not recom'd. Restudy with vertical classical ltrs., not to exceed 11 - 12" in height, 1/18/66.

170

1642-33rd St., NW
Richard W. Crenshaw

Replace front porch & stairs, remove rear porch & add terrace. Replace front door & all windows. Chg. 1st fl. double windows front & rear to French doors. Add light at front door. Enlarge basem. windows.

ACTION: Recom'd., provided that simple iron railing be used for front porch & stair rather than as shown on drawings, 1/4/66.

171

2934 M St., NW
Hodge House Carry Out Shop
Recom'd., 1/4/66.

1 9-sq-ft, s-f sign. 8" black classic upper case ltrs.

ADDRESS AND OWNER

PROJECT

NO
OG 66-

172 2617 P St., NW 2 s-f signs.

Seven-Eleven Stores
ACTION: Recom'd., 1/4/66.

173 1403 Wisc. Ave., NW Install exterior light fixtures for parking area.

Peoples Drug Stores, Inc.
ACTION: Recom'd., 1/4/66.

174 1659-61 35th St., NW
B & G Devel. Corp.

ACTION: Resubm. clear accurate drawings showing exist. conditions & proposed chgs. Replace exist. with new wood sash in exist. wood frames & in-stall shutters. Replace exist. with new wood stairs & porch. Indicate more exactly the types of windows to be used. Subm. better photos, 1/4/66.

175 1047-31st St., NW
Georgetown Car Wash

2 s-f signs, 28 sq-ft total. Illuminated.

ACTION: Not recom'd. Suggest placing main sign stating name of business on front of bldg. on recessed panel that exists above 31st St. door. Suggest smaller sign at entrance, 1/18/66.

176 3158 "O" St., NW

Vincent Golkoski (Commercial)

Constr. front entr. doorway frame in wood & copper canopy.

ACTION: Recom'd., 1/18/66.

177 3210 R St., NW

Abe Fortas

Basem. extension at rear of exist. residence. New swimming pool. New garden house (Abuts public alley).

ACTION: Recom'd., provided that all masonry walls visible from public space be faced with suitable brick. Either standard rose color or matching that on exist. house, 1/7/66.

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON OLD GEORGETOWN ACT APPLICATIONS (Continued)

1/18-19/66

NO ADDRESS AND OWNER

PROJECT

OG 66-

178 3286-88 M St., NW Brick sample. Same brick used at 3059 M St., NW. 1802 Wisc.
Sam Levy - John Snyder Ave. 1826 Wisc. Ave., NW
ACTION: Recom'd., 1/6/66.

179 2920 N St., NW Replace front wood stoop & steps with brick & flagstone &
Mrs Barbara Baldwin w.i. railing.
ACTION: Not recom'd. Incl. better photos. showing entire house & those adjacent. Recom. that brick steps
not be covered with flagstone. Indicate material of exist. railings. Suggest they be rehabilitated as
being more harmonious & in character with block, 1/18/66.

180 2916 N St., NW Same project & action as OG 66-179.

181 1628-32nd St., NW Add roof to exist. structure, with dormers for 3rd fl.
N.A. & E.B. Gibbs
ACTION: Recom'd., provided railings are eliminated from 3rd fl. cornice, & hopper windows are eliminated from
3rd fl. & a roof-top skylight or a simple single casement unit used. Roof shall be painted dark red, dark
green or dark gray, 1/18/66.

182 2524 Q St., NW New 3-story brick dwelling.
R. A. Eldridge
ACTION: Resubmit showing more exact detail of trim on windows and cornice. Suggest same cornice be used on
front & rear of structure. Show details of rear yard railing & ret. wall, also rear porch. Recom. that slid-
ing glass doors in family rm. be replaced with something more suitable. Show rear frames, headers, etc.
Submit exact exterior light to be used in front. Restudy 1st fl. front windows & their relation to upper fl.
windows, 1/18/66.

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON OLD GEORGETOWN ACT APPLICATIONS (Continued)

1/18-19/66

NO OG 66- ADDRESS AND OWNER

PROJECT

183 2611 Dumbarton St., NW

Mrs George Webster

ACTION: Not recom'd. Subm. is still inadequate, does not show exact door & window details, is not properly dimensioned, does not show trim. Proper photos would assist presentation. Drawing does not indicate if new door is exactly the same as exist. or how many lights are in Powder Rm. window, 1/18/66.

Close opening on side wall of bldg. Install new window for powder rm.

184 1814 Wisc. Ave., NW

Peter C. Laganas (Commercial)

New 4-story masonry structure.

ACTION: Not recom'd. Indicate material & details in rear elevation penthouse gable. Study running a continuous coping along rear roof, no break for penthouse. Give exact details of exterior lamps. Front of penthouse should not be screen on one side & solid on the other, 1/18/66.

189 1250-37th St., NW

Georgetown University

General University Library.

ACTION:

See attached ltr. dtd. 1/27/66 to the Rev. T. Byron Collins, S.J., Georgetown U., 1/27/66.

100-100000

100-100000

100-100000

100-100000

100-100000

100-100000

100-100000

100-100000

100-100000

100-100000

ars-1

AFTERNOON PROCEEDINGS

(3:00 p.m.)

(Aquarium - Revised Design)

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Proceed.

MR. YASKO: What we would like to do-- I might say Secretary Udall plans to come up later--

CHAIRMAN WALTON: He's always welcome.

MR. YASKO: Thank you, sir.

What we would like to do, we have two schemes here. One is a development of that we have coming in, and the other is a complete, fresh look related to the program. What we would like to do in the interest of time is to have the architect present both the schemes through, and then have our question and answer period, which we realize, of course, there isn't time, and I think we can get through it that way.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: We would like a presentation from the sort of philosophy involved in the two programs, and we have asked Mr. Bunshaft to speak for us.

MR. YASKO: Fine.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: I would assume Mr. Beckett was presenting a unified approach.

MR. BUNSHAFT: We don't want to go through the plan. We want the general concept architecturally.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: The location of the various tanks and that sort of thing.

MR. YASKO: There are certain elements of programming that have to be explained. We are not going to come through,

Exhibit 2

s-2

down the steps and through the closet. These are not important but the important things relate to the operation of the deal, and Mr. Beckett will make the presentation and we will take it in sequential development and then we can converge on the question and answer, and that will simplify the whole presentation.

Mr. Beckett, would you like to take it from here?

MR. BECKETT: Yes.

MR. BUNSHAFT: That silhouette you have, are there rooms underneath?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: The outside square (indicating model).

MR. BECKETT: That's underneath.

MR. BUNSHAFT: That sort of double line going around, that doesn't have a building below?

MR. BECKETT: This is below. This is the flow line underneath the tank.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I'm sorry. I don't mean to interrupt the meeting. Is there any building underneath here (indicating model)?

MR. BECKETT: No. That is the garden.

I know that you are pushed for time, and I will try not to go through every detail of it, but first of all I would like to discuss this, and what happened since our second meeting and the criticism that we had, in the structural approach and so on. We took off on this scheme.

s-3 I didn't really know until just now that we were going to go into both schemes, but we came to the conclusion, with Fisheries, that we had a better solution to the problem.

Going through this briefly--

MR. BUNSHAFT: Perhaps you ought to present the one you like best.

MR. BECKETT: Let me do this; it won't take much time. We like them both. They both have great merit. I think this meets your criticisms. We were in a bind with a rectangular building, to try to solve the unit of the living stream and administration in with one building. I think it was a good criticism.

We pulled those apart here, and we have our central animal-- I can't yet call it a fish-- tank in the center as a feature of the plan. We have answered Secretary Udall's request not to have a sea of parking, and to have a beautiful green belt, which I think we have done in both schemes.

There was some objection to no covered entry. From here on, of course (indicating model), it's going to take a lot of work with the bridge architect to know exactly how the elephant train functions, and this is true of both schemes, whether we come in on the second level, or whether we land at the grade level and come on in. No matter what happened there, we can do each from here on in as a building, unload under covered space, loop around and bring the buses back, or auto-

rs-4

mobiles can do the same.

But basically, this is our central tank, and the philosophy that we have been on for a year on this is that the flow, when we come out of the living stream, we want the exposure first.

We have abandoned the idea, on the floor below, of coming in and seeing this giant room and tank. Frankly, it was questioned, I think, by some of you, and by Fisheries, the glare around the area that we want dark. There is a big skylight over the top of that that might give us some problem, so we come in through the conditioning room, which they want. This is an immersion sequence of telling the story, through the living stream that is the feature of the exhibit, and then around a gallery. This is underneath. The skylight is not exposed to this point (indicating model).

Alternate groups can break line and go in as they are feeding the larger dolphins at some time. All of the aquariums that I have seen, even if they are not putting on a show, at feeding time, once an hour or two, people will break in all areas and watch it.

Both below and above, they go up the ramps at the four points, and we have seats up there where they can sit and meditate or rest or watch the fish jumping, the big fish.

This, we thought, was good, that we have the alternative of having people to go up and see the show and back and follow the line of the gallery exhibits, with the various small

-5 tanks.

Research is back here by itself (indicating model), near the entry, two stories. It's easy to expand-- this is an expansion-possible line-- and we have the big tank out into here and the community pools.

The living stream, which is a two-story element with no window requirements, we have put here in the garden.

We think we have solved the problem both for Fisheries for all the program that we could interpret. However, as we were developing this, this plan occurred to us: What, really, are we trying to do here? And I have spent quite a lot of time on the site. It's flat, almost to the river level-- to try to build an important building at this point didn't quite seem right. Why didn't we take an approach, a Washington approach, of more of a monumental? I would say it's a landscape architect's approach (indicating model), of creating a series of terraces up to this beautiful podium.

From the bridge here, you look down on this building from two angles. We weren't taking any advantage of a roof here but as people come out of the exhibit, you will notice in the flow pattern, they land here, and they can stroll through these various experiences of outside pool possibilities.

This, of course, compared to this (indicating both models), is unfair. This is ultimate, and these were both a crash program, and they are very rough. This is the first phase

-6 They are quite deceiving in their scale, because this second phase would bring a building clear our here (indicating model)

In the first phase of this-- Karl, why don't you pin that top plan up, if you would? This is Karl Schwerdtfeger, by the way, one of my associates, who has been working on this.

In the first phase, we leave out these elements, so that the light here, this building and this building-- this is the entry hall-- this is the dolphin tank, and this is the stream. These are the exhibits, research, and offices.

These are not in. Those would be sunken gardens, possibly a pool reflecting the future giant pool coming in.

We do have the chance here of about a hundred-car parking here in the interim. The 85 cars given to us in the program for staff we think is right, although we could fill in these triangles with parking if necessary.

But the first phase here would create our octagon shape. On the site plan, the octagon, with your Washington to Jefferson-- this is at right angles, and our entry is at 45 degrees-- I sort of feel that this is the scale of Washington, that it would be a Fisheries development meeting the program, and certainly expressing what's below it.

This, by the way (indicating model) would be glass. The seats come back up under that. These would have windows wherever necessary, and in the future, we would create various

types of forms within the program.

This is a 150-foot grid, with a 30-foot grid on the center line. The structure of this is very simple. The premium we pay for this in the first phase is very slight. I think here we have a much smaller thing with our first ten million dollars. We will sort of have the concept of a full development in the early stage by mounding up the dirt.

It's hard to describe the approach on this, but here is the grid system that will be laid out on the 30-foot center line of the 150. This exactly meets the program of everything we can conceive in their master program.

I would say this is more like a dyke approach, rather than architectural. We will have these units building up in an interesting pattern. We have the Secretary's request for a beautiful landscape approach, and it's certainly classical. Many of the temples have been built on terraces up to the buildings on the podium. And we have used the podium for the circulation of people.

In addition to that, we can drive up here onto this podium, the 30-foot grid, and have trucking anywhere necessary.

Under this entire thing, about eight feet above the water line, we have, starting with the filters, and then the main floor of the flow line of the exhibit plan is approximately 16 feet above water, and this is about 32 feet above the water line.

-8

In other words, the whole requirement here is to keep out that water with the big filters. This is 60 thousand feet of the filters, and we hope to get the public down here to see this; it being one of the biggest features, research, I think it would be extremely interesting. In either treatment we would do that.

The grid system is a simple structural concrete system laid out that would be easy to build. The only steel we would use would be over these large tanks, wherever they happen to occur.

This outside material on this is simpler. We see no reason why not to use a sculptured retaining wall of concrete. We could or could not have finished materials on these various elements besides concrete.

We do see this in a glass form, which is the shape of the tank.

You asked for our recommendation. We have been a year and a half working on this. We came up to this solution, and at the same time we began to fool around with this grid system of a non-- I would call it an architectural approach. Certainly it isn't the same approach you would use on a gallery or museum where housing a series of tanks, circulatory equipment. The plan, of course, is terribly important, which works out beautifully on this.

Could we put up a plan of this first phase, or second

phase?

I know you will have a lot of questions. I can see you simmering with them. I just wanted to hit, and I'm not doing it very logically, some of these main points.

It is the basic plan that would be important to us. You can see the flow line, having this large center as a functioning lobby where we break the traffic into several sections. It gives about equal importance to the tank and to the living stream, and the galleries in the rear, of course, there is research and offices back of that.

Now, we fill in these later (indicating), and they function beautifully. Their location, they are located right for the program.

I personally feel this is another building that can look in character with Washington. I think we have something here that can go down in history as one of the great aquariums of the world.

I admit it's a completely different approach, but it does follow the program.

We could, of course, take out all of this, and try to enclose this same plan, but I don't think we would have this beautiful concept of stepped terraces versus buildings.

I'm sure you do the same thing-- we go on the philosophy we never present two plans or solutions to a board, but it is interesting.

-10

You might ask the question here, "What happened to our suggestions on the other?" We think we have met them on that. I frankly think we have a finer plan on this one, and solution to the program.

MR. KELLY: Thank you, Mr. Beckett. Mr. Bunshaft, will you speak for the Committee?

MR. BUNSHAFT: You have a lot of clients, Fisheries, GSA, a few others, and maybe us, so it's kind of tough, and, also, we don't see this, except periodically. We don't like either of them.

We think-- I think I have a feeling maybe it's going around in circles or something, but this is a ten million dollar project that eventually will be doubled, or something like that, and from any distance there is nothing. It's all like-- it's sort of underground, and this one over here (indicating second model) is not architecture.

We don't see it, where the architecture is. As far as the plan, it probably works with the function thing, and maybe the Fisheries people have been beating you up too much. It isn't an architectural plan. We don't feel, and I don't know how to say it nicely, we don't feel that either of them are the right parterre, and we don't want to go into details. We just don't feel anything is coming out of this. I don't know what the answer is, but when you get this up at eye level you see nothing. This is an aquarium of the City of Washington

s-11

and it's very easy to crib, you know, and hard to do, but the word "aquarium" could mean to some people-- well, we don't want to tell you what to do-- it could mean more plastic shape or something. I don't know. But we don't think there is anything here that we would like to see built for an aquarium in Washington. That's simply put without getting into it.

What the answer is, it may be you have been working on it too long and too closely with all the headaches, but that one is all underground (indicating model). This one (indicating second model)-- I don't know. I don't know how big it is, but we feel it looks pretty lost from any distance.

It is true, you solved the entrance thing here, and yet it is almost as big as the building. We feel that there is no great idea. That's very easy to say, and very hard to do, and sometimes one never achieves it, the question of function incorporated into some idea that would be exciting.

I don't know of a worse client, and I guess we are a client, and a bunch of semi-professionals.

I don't know any other way to say it.

MR. BECKETT: I don't want you to be delicate. It sounds like we are presenting this after the decision has been made.

MR. BUNSHAFT: We can read plans. We spent the morning on it.

MR. BECKETT: What we need is strong guidance from

s-12

you. This has met your last criticism. It certainly will show its structural support of its base frame around this room.

MR. BUNSHAFT: It doesn't look like an aquarium.

MR. BECKETT: That's to scale. We're not trying to show detail here.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I want you to understand I'm not speaking for myself. Everybody thinks I'm a bastard. I'm speaking from the long discussion here, and they picked me to say it. We didn't want to confuse you by having different expressions, where everybody sounds off and everybody can take home their own interpretation.

We don't feel, as I say, that this is a terribly important building in Washington. It's isolated, can clearly be seen from great distances, and somehow we feel it has to have what an aquarium is. This is a nice building, but we don't think it is an aquarium.

MR. BECKETT: This perhaps calls for an underground building. Daylight itself is not important. It is a facility almost like a dike approach.

MR. BUNSHAFT: You mentioned a dike with a temple on top. That's exactly what you have. You have the dike, but you don't have the temple. What that calls for is a huge building and there have been opaque buildings built to house things. You take the fundamental that you are close to water. You

13 might want to stay up from the water condition and build an opaque building. I don't know.

MR. BECKETT: This is quite large. We can still have a jewel of a building on top of this podium, and certainly from a landscape standpoint we could do a far superior job, I think, on this versus that (indicating models).

MR. BUNSHAFT: There is one fundamental thing here that, to me, is so obvious. Here is water, and you are concerned about going too deep because of water level, and in spite of that you put the whole thing underground. The thing that seems to me fundamental is that you do just the opposite, stay away from the water condition and build your opaque building. This seems to me this is about the worst site you could pick to go underground, technically.

MR. BECKETT: As you look at it, it's a flat plane down there, and it seems we should have a podium.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I don't think there is any objection to a podium--

MR. BECKETT: We think--

MR. BUNSHAFT: We have this model so we can study it. You can't walk on those stairs; they are just visible from the air. I think there is a fundamental thing that seems to be strange, to be putting this into the ground when the ground is critical at water level. And this isolated site, there should be some mass you could see so that it's an aquarium or something.



-14 It's easy for us to say it, but we must say what we thing, and I think this represents all our thinking.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: We are united on it.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I know you have been on it for a long time, but I have a feeling something has to give.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Mr. Secretary.

(At this point, Secretary Udall entered.)

MR. BUNSHAFT: And we're not going to say it has to be structural and all that, because you would come back and say, "This answers your criticisms."

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Mr. Secretary, would you move your chair up, and would you repeat a bit of the burden of your statement for the Secretary of the Interior?

MR. BUNSHAFT: We had a long meeting on this this morning, and we all feel that Mr. Beckett has been working at this for a long time, and it's a tough problem-- he has a lot of clients-- and all we can say is that we don't think either of these are getting, in a broad sense-- it seems to me they don't have magnitude, a sense of aquarium quality to the architecture, whatever that is.

The one on the right is almost completely submerged, and as I was saying before, it was submerged where you are concerned with water levels, and you are putting the thing underground.

It's a rather prominent location on the river, and it

s-15

should be a building of some size that you would be aware of.

SECRETARY UDALL: It may be, Gordon. The thing that we have to be concerned about is that this is an aquarium of a unique sort. It's also an aquarium where most large aquariums are not, not in the semitropical climate, but in a temperate one, where you are going to have to have it enclosed and of course what is inside is the primary thing that we are concerned about.

Your primary concern must be the visual aspect.

MR. BUNSHAFT: We are concerned with all of it. We don't think you are going to get much of an impact wandering around these spaces.

It's easy to criticize, and it's hard to do, but in that somebody is asking us-- I'm not speaking for myself.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: We have asked him to speak for the whole Commission.

SECRETARY UDALL: I understand your system. You are pitching this ball game.

MR. BUNSHAFT: It's a tough thing, because there has been a lot of work on it, but the problem is to solve whatever the needs are and to get an expression that looks like an aquarium and a piece of architecture inside and out. We don't feel it is that.

SECRETARY UDALL: Let me ask you this question, because



-16 I spent a fascinating hour and fifteen minutes with the Frankl D. Roosevelt Commission this morning, and we ended up discussing that problem in terms of what the Commission starting out with a clean slate faces, and does the Commission approach this with the idea that visually, from the standpoint of its design that this must be a major structure that looms up and competes with the Jefferson Memorial or other large, imposing buildings

Is this the problem, or what is the problem in terms of the outward visual aspect as far as you are concerned? This is what I don't understand.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Keep answering, Gordon.

MR. BUNSHAFT: That one calls for a rather rough answer. I think when you get a good solution, it becomes obvious to everybody. It isn't a question of how large or how small or little. That's a tough statement to make, but I don't know any other answer to it.

We are not talking about large, or making it big artificially. It has to be within the money and within the needs you have, but how to do it, we also don't know, but this is a rather important project in the City, and it's a difficult thing for an architect to do work in Washington because of the many people he has to satisfy. There's no question it makes life pretty tough.

MR. BECKETT: Could I add this, Mr. Secretary: Evidently, this decision was made this morning, and we have just

17 learned the results after my presentation. I think we should have stronger direction here than we have had. From the point you asked, number one, at the last meeting, I presented this similar plan that was a rectangle, and we have solved, in this, not only the loading, but the symmetrical solution, and this met every criticism that I heard. We do have architecture here. This is 60 feet above the grass.

We have research where it should be, and the correct shape on the big living stream exhibit, and yet the direction I've heard is that they just don't like it.

It certainly is a building.

This is the opposite approach (indicating).

MR. BUNSHAFT: That's a building, but in our estimation it isn't an aquarium.

MR. BECKETT: As a building it's hard to describe what is an aquarium. We have it here. We don't want daylight. It's not a museum, it's not an office building as such. Most of the program requires dark space for exhibits.

I don't think anyone can debate the philosophy of, "There are so many temples in the world up to a podium," and it's classical in its form-- what is Washington?-- and more people will look down on this from the bridges than will go down to Haynes Point to see it. But this is an interesting approach.

Fisheries is very excited about the plan. It works



18 beautifully, this plan, better than this one, if I can speak for Fisheries.

We thought we had something that would go down in history as an all-time great. It's not an architectural approach, that is true. We don't think it calls for it. This octagon is in keeping with the grandness, the scale of Washington buildings. It's hard to get a building of this size to compete with some of your major buildings here. This does, with this approach.

I haven't heard a good reason of what's wrong with this except that this water point is really not valid, because we are above water. We do have a serious problem of adding to this building.

Now, this is the first phase of this one-- this is ultimate (indicating models). But in addition, where we add in these units, we still have a beautiful solution to start with with your \$10 million, and I think it's in scale with Washington. That is a small building, but that's the program. That's \$10 million.

MR. CAIN: I would like to ask one question, if I may. It seems to have been said that this isn't architecture because this isn't a building. My question is, can't you have architecture in a cluster of related things?

MR. BECKETT: That's what we have here.

MR. CAIN: And I got a statement, rather than anything I can understand. Could you comment on that, please?

19 MR. BUNSHAFT: How do you go about telling somebody what you think is good architecture? Are we going to give a course on architecture here? All I can say is that this group good or bad, we know something or we don't know anything. We don't think this is a solution for an aquarium.

We think it ought to be something aboveground that has some significance of expression of an aquarium. You keep drawing circles, and this underground plan works because it doesn't have to be architecture, just a layout in a loft space. Anybody can get a plan to work with that, put it underground. You try to turn that into a building aboveground then it becomes a challenging and difficult problem.

The problem is to get that to work and also to achieve a total building.

MR. CAIN: When you say a building, you mean one building?

MR. BUNSHAFT: You think you are negotiating with a lawyer. When you look at a painting, you either like the damned thing, or you don't, and if some guy changes a little red in the corner, that isn't the way to solve it.

MR. CAIN: The architects are asking for a guideline.

MR. BUNSHAFT: We are not trying to dictate anything. We are trying to say we don't find this satisfactory.

MR. BECKETT: This is a guideline we had.

MR. BUNSHAFT: We are giving you a guideline. We

20 don't like it. This is not me alone. If I were alone, I wouldn't be saying it this simply, but this is representative.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Absolutely.

MR. BUNSHAFT: If you would like to hear from somebody else, maybe it would be better.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: You had a point, Mr. Roszak.

MR. ROSZAK: I was struck by two things. Number one, that this is principally a concept based on a dike system. Now, if you are really going to go all out on a dike, it seems to me you could eliminate all those buildings and put the whole thing underground, or under water. That would be more consistently a dike concept. This becomes a compromise between what might be a dike translation and then almost a non-architectural approach-- these are your words, "This is a non-architectural approach."

Now, since you are willing to gamble with non-architectural attitudes, I think perhaps what is very essential is to ask oneself what precedes a non-architectural approach. How do you go about it? And this seems to me it must be one of the most difficult parts of something comparable to a trauma, when an architect has to raise such a question, because he is asking a question which works diametrically opposite to his whole training and belief, and perhaps that is essentially why we feel that this concerted expression of that schism in your own thinking-- when you develop an impression which works

-21 against your training as an architect, there is no question that you are going to produce such a result, and perhaps this is what we are seeing.

Now, let me just finish. I would suggest, if one is going to take an arbitrary position and a rather freewheeling attitude to a problem that is difficult, I'm sure the idea of an aquarium is more difficult than any program you will engage in. One doesn't build an aquarium every day. I'm sure there will be no other plan to house marine life in Washington if and when this gets built.

It seems to me we are going to establish freewheeling into an idea for an aquarium that is unique even among architects, and we are going to have to start with an approach, a philosophic approach, to an idea, and if one could allow oneself the ideological luxury of thinking ideologically, perhaps we could begin by way of approaching the entrance to the problem-- perhaps not the solution, but the entrance.

I must get back to the organic function of the marine life and the uniqueness of an aquarium, that an aquarium suggests. It's not "architectural," in quotation marks, because we accept biomorphic, curve linears, as non-architectural, and when we deal with an amorphic structure, or biomorphic movement, or a freewheeling form, we immediately get shaky, and we call it something else, but perhaps we should begin with that, and since it doesn't give us too many clues on which we

22 can rest our whole practice and allow us to say, "He can go ahead," I would say that philosophically we must return to the origin of the meaning of life itself, marine life, the presentation of its movement, the movement of water, the relationship to the whole, an almost limitless panorama of the presentation of marine life, so that we get the structure, the life, the participation of the human element and the drama that you yourself suggested in your first presentation, when you said it was essentially a "theorizing around."

I think when you dismissed that idea, you destroyed your concept.

The theorizing around, as a focal point, and taking into consideration the idea of marine life, aquatic movement, the undulating forms of the forces which propel both of these elements, I think working with free forms, free amorphic movements, and curve linear structures and round shapes-- as far as I am concerned-- would be the beginning of a philosophic approach and may suggest an idea which begins to resemble what we are talking about in the nature of an aquarium, and a structure which is uniquely different--

MR. BECKETT: It seems to me you are arguing for this plan. Marine life is under water level, you don't have sunlight.

MR. ROSZAK: To shut out light is not necessarily an answer.

MR. BECKETT: We have light where we must have it. Side light is not good.

MR. ROSZAK: If it becomes necessary for this structure to be primarily a dark enclosure, this is all the more reason you can give yourself the luxury of inventing within the confines of a magnificent approach.

In other words, this can be a form, completely enclosed, self sufficient, and it can serve the purpose by suggesting the forces that are involved in water, in fish.

MR. BECKETT: That's exactly what we have done in this plan.

MR. ROSZAK: Not as an individual phenomenon, not as a structure one looks at.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: I can't allow each member of the Commission that much time, because we would be here indefinitely.

Do you have anything further to say, Gordon?

MR. BUNSHAFT: I think I have said what we said.

MR. BECKETT: Can I ask the landscape architect's position on this?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: I think the total opinion of the Commission--

MR. SASKI: You can't divide design in architecture or landscape.

MR. BECKETT: Under the directions of the Secretary, he wants a beautiful garden here, and we are trying to bring

this into focus here.

24 MR. SASAKI: Our view is that we are interested in the total.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Mr. Secretary, do you have anything to say?

SECRETARY UDALL: No. I can understand plain speaking. We would like to build it.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: We hope you will. You are going to have a great building, too. We trust you will.

MR. YASKO: Mr. Chairman, may I have the floor?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Yes.

MR. YASKO: You notice I have kept my big mouth shut. There is a sense of futility here that I would like to resolve. Gordon was trying to stay within broad guidelines, and I can appreciate this, but we still are left in a suspended sort of vacuum in that we have the word "aquarium." I can agree with you, when it comes, it comes, and there is no discussion. But the futility is that we could be coming here on a basis of what looks like an aquarium, and nobody can really define it, except it is most abstract. Before we are to continue here, we must have a less broad-- not precision, not concise-- we can come in here each month and exhaust architect after architect until, some day, somebody hits this solution of what it is.

We ought to conscientiously try to pick some of this up when he did this, and we all took a big look at the program

5 and we all took a look at the program and said, "Let's work from the program," and here it is.

We can work another month or two, and decide we don't like it, and we can go home and try to decide what you are going to like.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Mr. Yasko, this is exactly what we don't want architects to be doing, or try to guess what our taste is. There isn't any such thing. We want him to design a marvellously made building, and there will be no problem whatsoever.

MR. BUNSHAFT: This is a problem, and I think it will be difficult for the Secretary to understand what we are talking about. Mr. Beckett knows what we are talking about. A building is a building. The Arvada Air Museum is a piece of architecture. That's what we are asking here, a piece of architecture that looks like an aquarium. If that isn't English, I don't know what is.

This is not it.

MR. KELLY: Mr. Chairman, I think it would be an insult to your architect, Mr. Beckett, to say we should give him ideas.

MR. YASKO: We don't want that. This is the pitfall of that suggested direction. We have seen it happen here. has happened on other projects.

Let's get away and try to explore a whole new approach

26 That's exactly what happened. Let's get back to the book and see if we have lost sight of the activities of the program, and this was almost a study session with the director of the aquarium. Let's get back to fundamentals and see what will happen.

MR. KELLY: What you have run into with us is a deep feeling that this is an important building in a marvellous location, and for whatever reasons, it hasn't succeeded yet in being the building we would accept. Mr. Beckett has to say what should be done. We can't do that.

MR. BECKETT: If you need guidance here, the seats go up here (indicating), this structural frame and shape is an aquarium. You must realize this is a one-sixtieth scale, and there is no detail on it to illustrate the feeling of it. We have talked about the water belts. We have it. Certainly this would be developed with water flowing.

I haven't heard a good criticism of this plan, which has been under a year and a half development, except that it doesn't look like an aquarium. I've seen all the aquariums in the world, and certainly we can do panels and waterfalls and murals of fish and this sort of thing, but this houses basic elements of an aquarium, and I will debate it to the Nt degree that this will look like an aquarium when it is done.

If we can get your concurrence on general masses--

MR. BUNSHAFT: We don't want "a building." We want

27

a great building, and that's the word. We're not going to do it by describing it with words. We have volunteered down here to help create a good standard of architecture, and we're going to be bastards. That's the only way we can be.

We have approved a few buildings when they first came in here, because they are damned good pieces of architecture.

I don't know what weight we carry, but we're going to keep that attitude. We would like to think we are semi-pros in this business.

MR. YASKO: I would like to summarize one point, and maybe take it from Bill's original philosophy, and maybe this is all we need.

These really represent two philosophies. Here, an attempt to get a building which is this way (indicating), recognizing the problem here with the views coming from the side. This building is going to be seen largely, it can be seen from a distance as this kind of a deal. This approach, as I look at it now, and it had been seen before, is a departure from a building as such on this plane.

This is trying to recognize very hard an approach of looking down on a series of forms and introducing areas for experiences of people. I think this is the philosophic distab

MR. KELLY: Don't try to search for "The" philosophy. These two represent two different approaches. There may be six others. Any of these might result in a very good building



I don't think we get anywhere by talking about what the philosophy should be. What we want is a philosophy--

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Mr. Secretary, I feel we have gone as far as we can on this. We are at your service at any time. Thank you for coming.

SECRETARY UDALL: Thank you.

MR. YASKO: All we can do is try to skin the cat again.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: We hope.

MR. YASKO: We hope.

oOo

Labor Department Building - Revised Design

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Mr. Yasko, we have told you informally that we find this a very attractive solution, and if you have any comment to make, do.

MR. YASKO: I would like to formalize for the record that we gave thought to the extension of the building. All we want to submit-- you have had a chance to look at the models-- it is the effect of the length of the building, what it did, and its environment. You have seen the model.

The architects will not go into anything beyond that point unless you so request.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: There were a couple of minor questions we wanted to ask about; for instance, that paved area at the lower edge of that wing.

